

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/785,410	Applicant(s) UEDA ET AL.	
	Examiner Matthew J. Ludwig	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/16/04</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the application filed 2/25/2004. The application claims priority to Japanese application 2003-140568 filed 5/19/2003. Foreign priority papers received 2/25/2004.
2. Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 7, and 13, are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. **Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sato et al, USPN 6,014,680 filed (8/29/1996).**

In reference to independent claim 1, Sato teaches:

The parsing module analyzes the document structure for the keyword/text model to verify whether the keyword/text model matches the parsing rule, and adds the tag information representative of the document structure detected during this process to the keyword/text model. The interim SGML document is generated from the keyword/text model added with the tag information (compare to “*applying a document structure altering rule, which is stored by storage means, to a first document structure definition expressing the structure of a structured document written in a document structure definition language...*”). See column 11, lines 30-67.

The instance of modified part in DTD generated by the replacement process is replaced by the modified portion of the interim SGML document. The portion between the two tags <CHANGE> and </CHANGE>. In this manner, the SGML document matching DTD preset for subject documents can be generated (compare to “*alteration rule includes a replacement rule for setting a document structure definition element name that is to be replaced in accordance with an element name contained in a document structure*”). See column 14, lines 1-67.

In this case, the start-tag information and end-tag information of the “ARTICLENO” are added to the pre-tag and post-tag of the keyword “ARTICLENO” of the keyword/text model (compare to “*an addition rule for setting a document structure definition element name that is to be added...*”). See column 12, lines 15-67.

The adjacent “ARTICLENO” and “ARTICLESTATEMENT” and a plurality of “PARAGRAPHS” can be summarized to the element “ARTICLE” in accordance with the production rules at the twelfth and fifteenth lines (compare to “*conducting an inspection on an individual element name basis to determine whether said second document structure definition is consistent with a corresponding document structure...*”). See column 12, lines 1-67.

In reference to dependent claim 2, Sato teaches:

The document structure usable in common in each filed of a document such as “technical document” and “business document” is set. Then, the document structure analysis rules manually generated in order to analyze a non-structured document and extract a document structured of it. See column 2, lines 10-45.

In reference to dependent claim 3, Sato teaches:

A document structure information extracting module refers to the modified DTD and generates string-corresponding element information describing elements in direct correspondence with a string (hereinafter called a “string-corresponding element”) and a contiguity relationship between elements”). See column 15, lines 50-67.

In reference to dependent claim 4, Sato teaches:

The document structure usable in common in each filed of a document such as “technical document” and “business document” is set. Then, the document structure analysis rules manually generated in order to analyze a non-structured document and extract a document structured of it. See column 2, lines 10-45.

In reference to dependent claim 5, Sato teaches:

The adjacent elements “PARAGRAPHNO” and “PARAGRAPHSTATEMENT” are summarized to a more abstract “PARAGRAPH” in the example of the keyword/text model. See column 12, lines 2-67.

In reference to dependent claim 6, Sato teaches:

The SGML document correcting module generates an instance of modified part in DTD which is a partial SGML document corresponding to the contents described in the DTD difference data. See column 14, lines 1-45.

In reference to claims 7-12, the claims reflect the apparatus comprising computer instructions for carrying out the methods as claimed in 1-6. In further view of the following, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2178

In reference to claims 13 & 14, the claims reflect the program for causing a computer to implement a conversion function and carrying out the methods of claims 1 & 2. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Judd et al.,	USPN 7,016,963	filed (07/21/2001)
--------------	----------------	--------------------

Suehira	USPN 6,922,697	filed (11/16/1999)
---------	----------------	--------------------

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 571-272-4127. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2178

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ML

April 11, 2006


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER